UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson | Louis L. Mann | Curtis W. Reese

Noise!

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Why I Shall Vote for Hoover

By JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

What Materials Build Character

By HAROLD SAXE TUTTLE

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part V. Chapter II.

By M. K. GANDHI

VOLUME CII | NUMBER 4

Chicago, October 8, 1928

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman T. Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 11, 1928, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

Editors:

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**
Curtis W. Reese **Louis L. Mann**

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages, containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country. His autobiography, "The Story of My Experiments with Truth" is now appearing in weekly installments.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is challenging the attention of the world.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of world religion.

Sample copies on request.

$3.00 per year.

700 Oakwood Boulevard **CHICAGO**

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 59
Noise!—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 61
Jottings—J. H. H. 62

ARTICLES—
Why I Shall Vote for Hoover—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 63
If True in War, Why Not in Peace!—*General Pershing* 64
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part V. Chapter II—M. K. GANDHI 65
What Materials Build Character—HAROLD SAXE TUTTLE 66
Not Like Other Colleges—CHESTER C. PLATT 67

POETRY—
To a Rose in Full Bloom After Frost—FRANCIS NEILSON 59
Igls-Austria—1928—LOUISE LOEB HAMBURGER .. 62
A Free Religion—ELMO A. ROBINSON 65

THE STUDY TABLE—
The World War—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 68

CORRESPONDENCE—
The Brahmo Centenary Celebration in India—J. T. SUNDERLAND 70
Beer and Whisky at Home and Abroad—WILLIAM C. ALLEN 70

THE FIELD—
The Centenary of the Brahmo Somaj 71
Is the Canadian Liquor System Working—*Senator Borah*, in *The Statesman* 72
Treatment of Minorities 72

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CII MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1928 NUMBER 4

TO A ROSE IN FULL BLOOM AFTER FROST

Rose of autumn, rarest bloom,
Careless of the summer's doom,
Heedless of the winter's gloom,
Laughing to your petal's tips,
Like a joy on happy lips.

Autumn rose of lovely sheen,
Lone in chill September's green,
Blooms of summer no more seen,
Sweet as mem'ry of a kiss.
Won in days of mirth and bliss.

Glory of a summer's day,
Into autumn gone astray,
As the sunsets wand'ring ray
Takes its passion to a cloud,
Where the east weaves night's dark shroud.

Rose of autumn, joy come late,
Royal bloom in richest state,
May my soul thee emulate,
In its autumn bloom anew,
Shedding gladness, as you do!

FRANCIS NEILSON.

Of all the topsy-turvy campaigns that we have ever witnessed, this present campaign takes the cake. There was confusion in the 1896 campaign, but it took the form of organized revolt, of silver Republicans against McKinley and of gold Democrats against Bryan. There was turmoil in the 1912 and the 1924 campaign, but it took the form of third parties carefully organized around the dominant personalities of Roosevelt and La Follette respectively. In this campaign the confusion is worse confounded than ever, but it appears in no definite, visible form anywhere. What we have is simply chaos—Republicans voting for Smith, Democrats for Hoover, Texas promised to the elephant, Pennsylvania claimed by the donkey—one grand whirl-i-gig, with everybody voting differently from what might reasonably be expected. We could almost say that, outside the ranks of politicians (and even these show surprising reactions!), we have found nobody who is going to vote next month as we anticipated. UNITY's staff is a case in point! Here are men of common outlook and spirit, if not of identical opinion. It might be presumed that the members of this staff might find in this campaign a candidate upon whom they would inevitably agree. Yet we publish the first of a series of articles in this number, presenting in due order the merits of each one of the four leading candidates for the presidency, and the articles on Hoover, Smith and Thomas are written each by a member of the family who is supporting the man in question. Personally we rejoice in this universal confusion. It is the greatest exhibition of independent voting in the history of the nation, and we believe that independent voting is the salvation of political democracy. Also, it gives an uncertainty about the contest which seems to us its only redeeming feature.

It was amusing to see our good friends, Frank Walsh and Frederic C. Howe, for whom we have unshaken admiration, addressing Governor Smith the other day, and presenting him with the 5,000,000 votes which were cast for Senator La Follette in the last campaign. We should like to know how and when and where these two men corralled these votes, and by what authority they pass them over to the keeping of the Democratic nominee. We have yet to hear that Governor Smith voted for La Follette in 1924, or was interested then or at any other time in anything that the Wisconsin statesman lived and died for. To the best of our knowledge, Governor Smith did everything in his power to defeat La Follette in the last campaign, and for the very good reason that La Follette stood for one cause and Smith for quite another. As for the situation today, we search the Democratic platform in vain for one least vestige of a suggestion of the platform upon which La Follette fought his great fight; and we find not a syllable in any one of the Democratic nominee's speeches which awakens to memory the stalwart voice of the "Little Giant." Let it not be forgotten that the Wisconsin Senator was the candidate in 1924 not only of the Progressives but of the Socialists. Today the Socialists are the heirs and assignees of all that La Follette stood for, not only in direct line of descent, but in spiritual fidelity to conviction and ideal. It is Norman Thomas, the candidate of the Socialists, who is carrying on Senator La Follette's work, as it is the platform of the Socialist Party which is the living embodiment of Senator La Follette's political ideas. Of the 5,000,000 and more voters who supported "Bob" in the last campaign, there will be many flutterers who will vote some for Hoover and

some for Smith; but the stout of heart, who see a cause and serve it to the end, will vote for Thomas.

The candidates in this campaign are developing a curious inability to express themselves clearly. President Coolidge's enigmatical "I do not choose to run" seems to have become contagious. Thus, Mr. Hoover, in his acceptance speech, discussed the Prohibition question. The "drys" hailed his statement as a personal committal to the support of the 18th Amendment and the Volstead Act. But not so the "wets!" Almost daily the Republican *Herald-Tribune* is informing its readers that Mr. Hoover is not a "dry," and that his Palo Alto speech means that he will change the law as soon as opportunity offers. It might be assumed that Governor Smith would avoid confusion of this kind, for he is a practised campaigner, warmly praised by all his friends for his perfect sincerity and frankness. He himself emphasizes his belief in these virtues. Thus, at Omaha he said, "I believe in talking out frankly and plainly and openly." Yet, in this same Omaha speech, he discussed the McNary-Haugen bill at length, and there are as many opinions as there are men as to whether he is for it or against it. Indeed, the more "Al" talks about farm relief, the more uncertain it gets as to what he thinks, or what if anything he proposes to do. The Governor's discussion of the tariff issue drops down the same blanket of fog over the political scene. Does Mr. Smith believe in a protective tariff, or doesn't he? If he does not, what about the Houston platform? If he does, wherein is his attitude any different from that of Mr. Hoover? At present, the Democratic candidate is simply saying on this subject something that sounds strangely like "Eenie, meenie, minie, mo," and that doesn't get us very far. All of which reminds us of Talleyrand's famous remark to the effect that language was invented to conceal thought—always assuming, of course, that there is any thought to conceal!

The Democrats are much excited about two things these days. One is the entrance of the Protestant churches into the campaign on the liquor issue, and the other is the so-called "whispering campaign" against Governor Smith. That the Democrats should be stirred by these phenomena is understandable enough, but there is an up-side-down sort of logic in their expression of indignation which is amusing to say the least. Take as an example of our meaning, the outcry of the New York *World* (a Smith organ) against Mrs. Willebrandt's now notorious speech appealing to the Methodists to support Mr. Hoover! In a succession of double-leaded editorial leaders, the *World* has called upon the Republican Party to disavow Mrs. Willebrandt's appeal, to denounce this and every other attempt to line up the church, to give up altogether all partisan appeals to organized religion. If this is not done, says the *World*, there will come a reaction of outraged public sentiment which will overwhelm Mr. Hoover in one vast flood of wrath. The very thing which the Republicans seem to be doing, in other words, is the very thing which is going to elect Mr. Smith! But if this is so, why does the New York *World*, which is moving heaven and earth to elect the Governor, shout its head off day after day in indignant demand to stop this sort of thing? Surely, if the appeal in the churches is bound in the end to prove so fatal to Mr. Hoover's chances, the *World* could ask nothing better than to have this sort of campaign go right on with increased momentum, and would be keeping a silence on the issue which could be heard from New York to California. No! The *World* knows, as every one else knows, that the alignment of the great Protestant churches against Governor Smith, whether right or wrong, and the disgusting "whispering" campaign against the New York Executive and his wife, are the very things which are destined to bring the Democratic cause to utter and complete ruin. We may regret it, as UNITY certainly regrets the whispering now going on, but the fact is what it is. The loud protests of the Democrats are as ridiculous as the pious disavowals of the Republicans.

It is getting pretty evident, as the political campaign goes on, that this religious bigotry business has two sides. On the one side is the sheer insanity and cruelty of the attacks upon Governor Smith because he is a Roman Catholic. With these attacks we have not the slightest sympathy; on the contrary, we think that Mr. Smith's simple, sincere, and perfectly open devotion to the church of his birth is one of his most commendable qualities. We have said once, and we would say again, that, other things being equal, we would rejoice to see a Roman Catholic president of these United States as a vindication of our fundamental American principle of religious freedom. But there is another aspect to the present situation, as we have said. There are bigots on the Democratic side as well as the Republican; and as the latter are saying that we should *not* vote for Smith because he is a Catholic, so the former are saying, or coming perilously near to saying, that we *must* vote for Smith because he is a Catholic. More and more the charge is being made—Governor Smith himself made it in his Oklahoma City speech—that opposition to the Democratic nominee on any grounds is only a dishonest cloak for opposition to him on religious grounds. Do we oppose him because personally and politically he is a "wet"? Do we oppose him because of his life-long affiliation with Tammany Hall, which even a Smith organ like the New York *Times* calls a perfectly reasonable source of repudiation? Do we oppose him because of his utter ignorance and complete incompetence in the field of international

relations? Do we oppose him—for any legitimate reason? It makes no difference, according to the Democrats. All these are screens for religious bigotry. Which means, if it means anything, that no honest man can oppose Smith on any honest grounds! Two can play at this religious bigotry game, and two *are* playing at it. Of the two, we think the Democrats the more disreputable.

It is good news from England that a determined campaign for the abolition of capital punishment is now under full headway in that country. It seems that the Oscar Slater case has stirred the Kingdom to its depths. This man, it will be remembered, was convicted for murder on what seemed to be sure testimony—but, owing to certain pitiful circumstances, his sentence of death was happily commuted to life imprisonment. After lying behind the bars for many years, Slater was this summer released on testimony which proved that he had nothing whatsoever to do with the crime. Such an escape as this conjures up the ghosts of hundreds, perhaps thousands, through the years, who have been convicted and executed by the state for offenses of which they were innocent. Now is launched in England a great public movement for a national petition to Parliament for the abolition of the death penalty. This movement is headed by no less a man than Lord Buckmaster, formerly Lord Chancellor of the realm. It is supported by Sir Herbert Samuel, who as former Home Secretary had the painful duty of refusing reprieves for numerous convicted murderers. It is expected that this proposed petition will receive large public support, and therewith give Parliament the basis for legislation abolishing this last relic of barbarism. Sir Herbert Samuel suggests, as an *ad interim* measure, that Parliament request the Home Secretary to grant reprieves and commutations of death sentences to life imprisonment uniformly during a stated period, as a trial to see what effect the practise would have upon the murder rate in the British Isles. This seems scientific, if a bit fantastic. We believe that the case against capital punishment has already been proved, and we hope that the movement now launched so auspiciously in England will bring a speedy ending of this legal horror.

Noise!

Some weeks ago, an amazing thing happened in New York! An aeroplane, equipped with an amplifier which magnified the human voice 100,000,000 times, flew low over the crowded streets, offices, shops and homes of the city. In this aeroplane, in addition to a singer who sang songs every now and then, was a man who kept shouting persistently through the amplifier, "Smoke Old Golds," "Smoke Old Golds."

The speaker's voice was like the roar of an earthquake. It was heard for miles. It entered every window, penetrated every remotest room, boomed into every helpless ear. There was no escaping it—theatre audiences had to listen, public meetings had to be suspended, conferences were adjourned, babies were awakened from sleep, and the sick in hospitals alarmed or profoundly disturbed. While this aeroplane flew, nothing else could be heard—nothing at all done. It was a case of a whole city suspending operations, while its ears were shattered as though by the reverberation of a million machine guns.

When we first read the story of this exploit, we recoiled with horror. We instantly had visions of flocks of competing aeroplanes flying over a city, and assailing the ears of the people as bill-boards and electric-signs now assail their eyes. Where is the dug-out that could protect from such bombardment? Further consideration, however, calmed us, even cheered us, for it seemed to us that this atrocity is perhaps the last straw which will break the back of the public's patience.

How much longer, friends, are we going to stand the hideous riot of noise that now envelops us day and night? Loud-speakers blaring from shops and apartments, unmuffled motor-engines racing on every street, automobile horns screeching at every corner, automatic piano players, steel-riveters, hurdy-gurdies, street-hawkers—and now amplifiers bellowing down upon us from the skies! Even the country and the seaside furnish no escape these days from ceaseless din. The automobile rushes by on every road, the radio is in every open-windowed cottage, and the talking machine blares forth its raucous jazz in the camp, on the mountain-top, and even in the canoe upon the lake at evening. A certain unhappy Englishman, driven frantic by city noises this past summer, went to the seaside for a little peace and quiet, only to have his "siesta upon the beach broken into by the strains of a loud-speaker fitted up on a yacht which was making excursions along the coast by way of advertising an enterprising daily newspaper."

That revolt against these multiplying noises of contemporary civilization is no mere outburst of hysteria on the part of neurotic invalids, is shown by a recent statement on the subject by Professor W. A. Spooner, of Oxford, England. "Civilization," he says, "has never before been confronted by such a malignant plague." Few people realize, he continues, the havoc wrought upon our physical and nervous systems by the noise to which we are constantly being subjected. Professor Spooner especially fears the injurious effects upon the growing generations, who are being exposed

to assaults which no human system was ever built to sustain. And worse, he says, rather than better is to come! "Much could be written," says Professor Spooner, in an article in the *Fortnightly Review,* "about nuisances such as barking dogs, shouting newsboys, ice cream vendors, barrel organs and the like; but all these, I am afraid will be less distracting and injurious than the overpowering droning noise of fleets of airplanes at all hours of the day and night, should flying become universal."

It would seem as though the inventive genius of man could devise ways and means of suppressing noise instead of magnifying it. Our scientists are working miracles. Is it altogether impossible for them to construct a silent motor? The answer to this question is probably not impossibility, but indifference. Our engineers do not think that noise is a matter of any importance. Indeed, there are alarming signs that many people, including engineers and scientists, we have no doubt, have become so degenerate that they actually *like* noise. Which brings us to Professor Spooner's suggestion that the medical section of the League of Nations take up what is now become a world problem —"the prevention and abatement of unnecessary noise"! But why wait for the League of Nations, or wander thus so far afield? Why not organize forthwith in all cities and villages militant Anti-Noise Societies which shall see to it that this hideous matter is forthwith made a matter of regulation by the public health authorities? *Most noises are unnecessary.* That's the starting point! Now add to this the knowledge, amply provided by enlightened physicians, that noise is ruinous to good health, to say nothing of good manners and good morals, and the battle is won.

What we need is rigorous social control of a situation which has hitherto hardly even attracted social attention. Unless this is accomplished, and accomplished quickly, "the amenities of civilization," says Harold Begbie, "must cease to exist."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Jottings

The only state or territory in the United States which has no subscriber to UNITY among its inhabitants is Alaska. We hope this issue of our paper will reach some Alaskan who will have public spirit enough to send in his subscription and thus save his homeland from this undesirable notoriety.

Prohibition is being enforced on German railways. Officials are convinced," says a despatch, "that greater speed of trains can safely be risked only when employees refrain from drinking alcoholic beverages." The inevitableness of Prohibition in this age of machinery is like the movement of the stars!

Charles H. Dana used to say that it was "news" not when a dog bit a man, but when a man bit a dog! If he were alive today, in this presidential campaign, Mr. Dana would revise his judgment. It used to be "news" not when a Republican voted for the Republican candidate and a Democrat for the Democratic candidate, but when a Republican or a Democrat, jumped his party and voted for the other side. This year, however, it is front-page, headline stuff when a Republican announces that he will vote for Mr. Hoover, or a Democrat that he will vote for Governor Smith.

Tammany Hall has a real place in the presidential election this year. If any voter wants to know the truth about this political organization, let him read M. R. Werner's new book, "Tammany Hall."

It is probable that in the nation, and in the several states, a total of not less than $10,000,000 will be expended in this campaign. And it is probable that, if the election were held on September 6th instead of November 6th, and $9,000,000 saved, the result would be the same. Still, without money, there would be no politicians. So why complain?

Two Republican converts to Governor Smith in this campaign are the son of the late Senator Quay and the nephew of the late Senator Penrose. Mr. Hoover certainly does have all the luck!

J. H. H.

Igls-Austria—1928

The tragic Christ is everywhere
In this strange Austrian land;
He feels so close to me,—this Jew.
He seems to understand
My hurts and piques and little spites,
Ambition's ironies.

He knows that close beside them lie
Some few nobilities.
Dig deep, my soul, and find where love
Glows warm,—till stirring,—fleet,
There comes new kinship with this man
Of bleeding hands and feet.

LOUISE LOEB HAMBURGER.

Why I Shall Vote for Hoover*

Because I consider him the best equipped man who has ever been named for the office. I mean nothing extravagant. Time alone will tell how great he may prove as President. American history would have been much more satisfactory if real executives had always been sought for the Presidency. None of the presidents, so far as I know, has been so manifestly trained and experienced for the task as is this candidate.

Not alone on these general principles do I rejoice in the opportunity to vote for Mr. Hoover, but I consider him peculiarly fitted for the choice at just this time. This is the age of the engineer. Mr. Hoover is an engineer of first rank. Everybody recognizes him as such, and not least outspokenly the members of the profession themselves. In other offices of public trust the engineer is being utilized with great profit to the public. I think we need an engineer in the Presidency right now.

Our international relations were never before so important, either from the American point of view, or from the point of view of the world as it looks towards America. No president has ever known his world so well as Mr. Hoover knows the present world. The rest of the world would probably elect him to the American presidency by acclamation, if they had the chance. Their sentiments are not prompted by a desire to take advantage of us, or to gain anything at our expense. They know Mr. Hoover will aways be a good American. But they also know that he knows his world, that he is and will continue to be a world statesman. They are tired of having world interests under our control muddled by ignorant American diplomacy. I sympathize with them profoundly. Ignorant as I am in world politics, I still crave real international statesmanship for American world contacts.

In respect of our internal needs of statesmanship, Mr. Hoover seems to me quite as admirably fitted to lead. This is the age of humanism. The philosophy is taking hold in business, in industry, in culture, in the educational process, even in religion. We need it in politics. No event I can think of would advance humanism farther and more rapidly than the installation in our most influential office of the world's foremost practical humanist. I shall run out on the street the morning after the election, if Mr. Hoover is elected, and shout to all the shuffling multitudes of unemployed and occupationally misfitted, and not less confidently also to the suffering and much befuddled farmers, bidding them take courage and hail the new day which will have dawned upon them. Not that Mr. Hoover is a wizard, nor that he will magically make jobs spring up where there are no jobs, nor that he will by the waving of his wand make the worker love his work who hates it. But I shall hail his election as ushering in an era of scientific approach to these industrial and social problems, where now social worker and industrial organizer are alike muddling and floundering. I believe he will inspire measures through various government departments which will tincture and mould the whole industrial and social process of our civilization. I cannot think of another event which would so effectually seal this century as the era of social progress and human well-being as would eight years of Herbert Hoover in the Presidency of the United States at this turn of affairs.

So much, in skeleton brevity, for my positive hopes. Have I qualms? Yes, some, but growing less and less serious. What has disturbed me most has been Mr. Hoover's reputed attitude on the public control and operation of monumental public resources and utilities. I believe the pyramiding of stock-and-bond burdens upon the private utility corporations must eventually bankrupt them, and, in that event, do some very painful if not disastrous things to the American public.

Mr. Hoover is an engineer. He believes in efficiency almost as a gospel. That is one reason I so greatly admire him. The engineer soul within him has been grieved and outraged by the muddling in public administration which he has had all too abundant opportunity to witness. I can sympathize with him, up to a point, in the conclusion that he seems to have reached, that government should keep out of business, and should utilize all of the resources of initiative and efficiency which have been developed or can be developed under corporate operation of public utilities. The practical realism of the man has apparently driven him to this conclusion. If I am right in my conviction that irresponsible exploitation of utilities by private corporations will, even under the most effective possible government regulation, eventually break down that system, I am ready to trust that that same practical realism will bring him also to this conviction.

For I believe him to be devoted to the public good. I make no doubt of that, and simply smile when special pleaders seek to make him out a grafter, or the henchman of "special interests." If he is in error, he is in error; he is not befuddling nor fighting his own conscience in the interests of a policy which is going to serve certain private monopolies. I know of no one whom I will trust more fully to strike out right when he is convinced of the right. I have to trust his engineering skill and his administrative discrimination even against my own judgment upon governmental technique.

Corruption? Yes, I have been much disturbed at realizing that he was in close official association with Fall and Daugherty. I give him credit for too keen powers of observation not to have known that something pretty bad was going on. But when I try to figure out just what I would have preferred that he do rather than what he has actually done, I find myself at a loss.

He might have leaned forward, pointed across the table at one or another of his colleagues in the cabinet, and have said, "Mr. President, there sits a crook whom I demand that you forthwith fire out of here." If he had done that, I would not now have the chance to vote for him, nor should have wanted it. Or, he might have meekly tip-toed out of the cabinet room, when he observed what was doing, packed up his pens and papers at the Commerce Department office, and departed for Dahomey or Tasmania to dig gold or silver or copper out of the hills for what he and his corporation could make out of it. In that case also I should be voting for somebody else this fall, never sus-

*First of a series of four articles on the presidential candidates. See editorial comment in this issue.—Ed.

pecting what I would have missed in having forgotten all about him.

Whether there is still another course, different from that which he has actually followed, which might have made more effectually for honesty and sound government, I do not know. I can think of none now. He is not a muck-raker. He has not figured conspicuously in the measure of clean-up which has been achieved in Washington. That he has worked potently within government councils for what has been accomplished in this particular, I have all confidence. That he has personally participated in any of the corruption which has prevailed in Washington during his service there, I do not believe for one moment.

Partisanship? The Hoover I shall vote for did not know in 1920 whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. That is one reason I am voting for him. There is delicious humor in the fact that in that election the Democrats in the state where the Republican party was born instructed their delegates to their national convention to vote for Hoover as the Democratic candidate! I hope that those Democrats were good Americans in making that choice and that they will retain their loyalty in this election.

A conference of more or less eminent political scientists has recently agreed that the present election will mark the collapse of our two old political parties. I heartily hope so, though one finds it difficult to be quite so sanguine. No other event, I think, would so hasten that end as the election of Mr. Hoover. I think he will organize an administration at Washington, out of four and certainly out of eight years of which the present type of partisan politics will come sick unto death. I therefore vote for him with both hands. He will render great and monumental service, if he is elected, but few achievements will be so great as contriving the event by which his successors may be saved the ignominy of countenancing and participating in the fustian which now is inseparable from achieving the Presidency through a party machine.

My latest qualm is more than a qualm. It came near being a swoon on the night of the acceptance speech when I heard Mr. Hoover's utterances on military preparedness. Friends, who sat in the same room as the words came over the radio too clear for misunderstanding, say I almost toppled off my seat. Perhaps Mr. Hoover needed to indulge in that bit of jingoism so as to put himself right with the big navy group in Washington. Perhaps he knows them and their power better than I do; but I heartily wish Mr. Hoover had not said, or even remotely thought, what he has said about military preparedness. I know he would not make good as commander-in-chief of military expeditionary forces. Thanks to recent international developments and to the welling sentiment of the American people, I have growing confidence that he will not have the chance to function as a military chieftain.

Those who support any party ticket must be prepared to take their bitter with their sweet. What Mr. Hoover has said about military preparedness is the bitter dose which I must swallow along with the political sweets which his candidacy supplies. I trust, now that it is down, that no event of the future will transpire to raise my gorge.

So my qualms are largely dissipated by directly facing them. They are blown clean away when I face the alternative of voting for somebody else. I have no doubt many citizens will vote for Governor Smith; but I do not dare vote for him. I feel too deeply on the Prohibition issue, and fear too intelligently the power he would have and would certainly use to bring this now jeopardized social program to disaster. I thank William Allen White for pointing out the fact so cogently that the next President will likely have several places to fill on the bench of the Supreme Court. And some of them may be exceedingly precious seats. I would not trust Governor Smith with the appointing power in reconstructing a Court through which the most eminent and socially significant governmental achievement of our times might be annulled by a single verdict. A weak Court through the Dred Scott decision helped to give us the Civil War. I do not wish to see serious mischief wrought again by political evasion or jugglery.

Nor can I trust Tammany Hall under any conditions. Let it be demonstrated with never such cogency that Governor Smith is personally honest; yet there is no evading the fact,—he himself does not evade it,—that he has given his best political energies to the building up of this picturesque institution of refined and wholesale political corruption. To install this organization at the center and heart of our national government in Washington would, it seems to me, be a disaster from which the nation could not fully recover during the rest of the century.

A momentous evil which would come of his election would be the fastening of the present decadent two-party system on our national life for a further indefinite period. His defeat, on the other hand, in the judgment of numerous political seers, will mark the end of the motley aggregation which calls itself the Democratic Party. With its collapse, its Republican companion in political ineptitude must also soon thereafter go to pieces. It would be tragic to miss the present opportunity to insure this twofold benison.

No so-called third-party offers the shadow of a chance for a serious-minded citizen to make his vote count, unless it be by a quiet little protest against things as they are and as they are probably going to be. At times such a protest is highly comforting. It does not seem so to me this time. I have espoused many forlorn hopes in the past, and shall doubtless support with my feeble might many another in the future. But a third-party vote this year seems to me necessarily so inconsequential that I am all the more grateful to Mr. Hoover for giving me a chance to cast a ballot that will count, and over which I can at the same time be enthusiastic.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

IF TRUE IN WAR, WHY NOT IN PEACE!

Banish the entire liquor industry from the United States; close every saloon, every brewery; suppress drinking by severe punishment to the drinker, and if necessary, death to the seller, or maker, or both, as traitors, and the nation will suddenly find itself amazed at its efficiency, and startled at the increase in its labor supply. I shall not go slow on prohibition, for I know what is the greatest foe to my men, greater even than the bullets of the enemy.

General Pershing (in 1917)

The Story of My Experiments With Truth

PART V—CHAPTER II

With Gokhale in Poona

The moment I reached Bombay Gokhale sent me word that the Governor was desirous of seeing me and that it might be proper for me to respond before I left for Poona. Accordingly, I called on His Excellency. After the usual inquiries, he said:

"I ask one thing of you. I would like you to come and see me whenever you propose to take any steps concerning Government."

I replied:

"I can very easily give the promise, inasmuch as it is my rule as a Satyagrahi to understand the viewpoint of the party I propose to deal with, and to try to agree with him as far as may be possible. I strictly observed the rule in South Africa and I mean to do the same here."

Lord Willingdon thanked me and said:

"You may come to me whenever you like, and you will see that my Government do not willfully do anything wrong."

To which I replied: "It is that faith which sustains me."

After this I went to Poona. It is impossible for me to set down all the reminiscences of this precious time. Gokhale and the members of the Servants of India Society overwhelmed me with affection. So far as I recollect, Gokhale had summoned all of them to meet me. I had a frank talk with them all on every sort of subject.

Gokhale was very keen that I should join the Society and so was I. But the members felt that as there was a great difference between my ideals and methods of work and theirs, it might not be proper for me to join the Society. Gokhale believed that in spite of my insistence on my own principles I was equally ready and able to tolerate theirs.

"But," he said, "the members of the Society have not yet understood your readiness for compromise. They are tenacious of their principles and quite independent. I am hoping that they will accept you, but if they don't you will not for a moment think that they are lacking in respect or love for you. They are hesitating to take any risk, lest their high regard for you should be jeopardized. But whether you are formally admitted as a member or not, I am going to look upon you as one."

I informed Gokhale of my intentions. Whether I was admitted as a member or not, I wanted to have an Ashram where I could settle down with my Phoenix family, preferably somewhere in Gujarat, as being a Gujarati I thought I was best fitted to serve the country through serving Gujarat. Gokhale liked the idea. He said: "You should certainly do so. Whatever may be the result of your talks with the members, you must look to me for the expenses of the Ashram which I will regard as my own."

My heart overflowed with joy. It was a pleasure to feel free from the responsibility of raising funds and to realize that I should not be obliged to set about the work all on my own, but that I should be able to count on a sure guide whenever I was in difficulty. This took a great load off my mind.

So the late Dr. Dev was summoned and told to open an account for me in the Society's books and to give me whatever I might require for the Ashram and for public expenses.

I now prepared to go to Shantiniketan. On the eve of my departure Gokhale arranged a party of selected friends taking good care to order for refreshments of my liking, *i. e.*, fruits and nuts. The party was held just a few paces from his room, and yet he was hardly in a condition to walk to and attend it. But his affection for me got the better of him and he insisted on coming. He came but fainted and had to be carried away. Such fainting had not happened for the first time, and so when he came to, he sent word that we must go on with the party.

This party was of course no more than a converzazione in the open space opposite the Society's guest-house, during which friends had heart to heart chats over light refreshments of ground-nuts, dates and fresh fruits of the season.

But the fainting fit was to be no common event in my life.

M. K. GANDHI.

(Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai.)

A FREE RELIGION

None in the days of the ancients had dreams of unfettered religion.
Socrates failed to appeal, as did Jesus, to freedom of conscience.
Roman and Greek, like the Hebrew, were ready with force and coercion,—
Woe to the man independent who wished for a new mode of worship!

Out of the clash that arose from the dogmas of Christian intolerance,
Met as they were by the cruel, imperial laws, persecutions,
Rose the new theory that man had a right to his worship in freedom.
Yet, when the power was theirs, these same Christians were ready to torture.

Centuries later this dream was reborn in the mind of Socinus.
He and his pupils, in contact with those of the new Reformation,
Took the broad view of a tolerant faith to the far Transylvania,
Took it to Germany, Holland, and thence to Great Britain. 'Twas welcome.

Here in America colonies struggled for very existence.
Some followed custom; established a church to which all owed allegiance.
Williams the Baptist proposed an experiment strange in that era;
He made Rhode Island a land of the utmost, unquestioning freedom.

Baltimore, Catholic, sought the same ends in fair Maryland's borders.
Quakers established their home, Pennsylvania, that welcomed the outcast.
Jefferson led in Virginia the struggle for church independence.
So in America came to fruition the dream of the ages.

Let us, the freedmen, redeemed from the ancient oppressive restrictions,
Prize to the utmost the liberties won by the blood of the martyrs.
May no new tyrant beguile us by claiming, "The people are tired of Freedom."
Still may we worship Emmanuel—Him who is God of the People.

ELMO A. ROBINSON

What Materials Build Character

Among the applications of educational measurements not the least significant is that of testing methods of religious education. A considerable mass of literature has already sprung up and a significant number of careful studies have already been made in the field of religion.

One problem which has come to the focus of public attention in recent years is that of the material to be used in the week-day schools of religion. This movement sprang up so rapidly and has won such popular favor that its place in the general program of religious education is now assured. Because of its very newness and freedom from slavery to past tradition the week-day school of religion offers a unique challenge to the modern educator.

Apparently the public feels the need of some religious training beyond that which is given through denominational agencies, and of moral training beyond that which results from the public school program. Indeed, the public probably does not distinguish between these two objectives. Character is the thing desired. If the churches secure it, well and good; if the schools can cultivate it, that too is good. If either fails, the problem is increased; if both fails, the situation is critical. Society wishes the rising generation to be educated for ethical conduct. A considerable part of society is not convinced that this object can be obtained without the motivation of religion, and so the week-day school of religion is meeting approval and rapidly growing.

The practical question has already become apparent to both religious and educational leaders, "What shall be taught in these week-day schools of religion, and how shall it be taught? Shall the movement become a means of intensifying sectarian differences and cultivating a consciousness of the division of religion, or shall the churches unite in a common program furnishing the children of the schools with such common essentials of morality and religion as all can accept as indispensable, leaving sectarian emphasis for the Sunday Schools?"

The curriculum introduced in the week-day schools generally has been made up chiefly of Biblical material. This very fact has constituted a problem, partially overcome only because there is so strong a sentiment against sectarianism. The cause for disagreement still exists so long as the basic material is taken from the Bible; for sectarian differences arise primarily from variant interpretations of the Bible. But what alternatives are there? Do we not face a hopeless dilemma?

Dare we consider the alternative of omitting the Biblical material from a school of religion? The answer depends upon the motive. If the motive is that of modernist propaganda, such a policy will fail; for the week-day school of religion can not succeed if it becomes an agency for propaganda of any kind. If, on the other hand, the motive is to find religious material upon which all religious agencies can agree, it is entirely possible that this effort may succeed.

Three other types of material suggest themselves because they are already being used in some degree by nearly every agency of religious education. Worship is a feature of all religion. Increasingly, religious schools are training children in worship, and providing for higher art on the part of our leaders of worship. Increasingly, worship is coming to be looked upon not as a source of instruction but as an agency for cultivating attitudes and ideals. In the interests of consistency didactic elements are more and more being excluded from the worship service. Hymns are being selected for their musical qualities rather than for their mere vivacity. Responsive readings and other forms of antiphonal services are being introduced for their beauty and reverential effect, not for teaching content. Here is a possibility of religious training involving no basic disagreement in theory of church organization, in doctrine, or in interpretation of the Bible.

A second feature that has increased in favor among all religious agencies in recent years is the practical project in religious service. The slogan, "learn by doing," has been accepted as applying to religious life. Children who are organized into groups and stimulated to serve, to give, to cooperate in some altruistic effort become more religious in that very process. Here is a second possibility of religious education involving no sectarian disagreement.

A third type of material is that of direct ethical instruction. In recent years the suggestion has often been repeated that character is caught, not taught. Many modern teachers protest against any form of direct ethical instruction; yet the last decade has seen the creation of a large number of codes of morals with a resultant increase rather than decrease in the vital outcomes for which they stand. And one or two careful researches seemed to show that practical conduct was improved by direct ethical instruction. So that here is a third possibility of material on which there can be no denominational quarrel.

Now if these three types of material could be utilized by the united agencies of religion in the week-day schools, leaving the Biblical material for the Sunday Schools, a most significant increase in efficiency in the total program of education could be brought about.

The present purpose is not to discuss the partisan viewpoints or to refute the arguments against such a program, but only to answer, and that but partially, the one question, Would such a program, from which Biblical teaching was omitted, produce desired effects upon character in a degree at all comparable to the effects produced by biblical teaching? Manifestly, the gains in such a cooperative program, free from sources of disagreement or friction, would be very great. If the losses were not correspondingly great, the plan would commend itself to all thoughtful educators.

The attempt to measure with some care, even though on a small scale, the relative effectiveness upon character of these three types of teaching as compared with Biblical teaching was recently made by the author.* In six groups of Sixth grade children, totaling one hundred fifty, the four types of material which have been mentioned were presented in different combinations carefully controlled. Three forms of tests were used to determine the effect upon character. One test sought to measure religious ideas, a second social atti-

*Reference is made to a study of selected types of material for a curriculum of religious education in connection with the week-day school of religion of Eugene, Oregon.

tudes, and a third indicated actual performance in the form of honesty or cheating in scoring papers in a contest.

The results of the study were most convincing in showing that of the four elements studied, direct ethical training had far the greatest effect upon immediate honesty. In the group in which all four elements were included, seven out of nineteen pupils cheated in the opening test. Of these seven, five did not cheat at the end of four months' training. In the group which was trained by the use of the code of ethics, Christian service, and Bible teaching, twelve out of twenty-two cheated in the preliminary test, eight of whom refrained from cheating at the end of the term. In the group in which ethical training, worship and Bible teaching were included, ten of the twenty-four cheated at the beginning, four of whom did not cheat at the end. But in the group from which ethical instruction was omitted only one reformed, while eight who had not cheated at the start cheated at the end. In the other group from which ethical training was omitted, there were no cases of reform, but a slight increase in cheating.

The conclusions which seem inevitable, in so far as this small group is typical, quite reverse the commonly accepted idea that ethics must be taught indirectly rather than directly.

Just what value religious knowledge and ideas have in actual conduct is problematical as is also the value of social attitudes, which may indicate, not what the subject would do, but what he thinks the examiner thinks he ought to do. The improvement in regard to ideas and attitudes in the study of this small group did not correlate at all closely. While there were some consistent gains in attitude, they were too small to be dependable without wider confirmation. Religious ideas tended toward mature judgments more rapidly on the part of those who did not study the Bible than on the part of those who did; but there was no consistent gain under any one of the other elements.

No evidence that can be gathered from the study here reported shows any advantage in character growth among those who were trained in Bible study as compared with those who were trained in worship, Christian service, and direct ethical instruction.

While of course the chief conclusion to be drawn from this study is that a more extensive study is necessary before recommendations can be given with confidence, at least there is a strong suggestion that the way may be open to harmonious and effective cooperation by all religious agencies in the week-day and vacation schools of religion without the use of Biblical material, which is the source of greatest friction and disagreement, and at the same time without loss of effectiveness in the cultivation of Christian character.

HAROLD SAXE TUTTLE.

University of Oregon.

Not Like Other Colleges

"Does Brookwood have a faculty that can be compared with the faculties of other regular colleges?"

"Yes," I said, "only it is composed of men and women of a superior type as to morality and economics. The electric power interests know it. They would not even try to corrupt them by proposing to edit and delete their text books, or to hire them to go out making speeches in behalf of the monopolistic control of water powers."

This was a few days ago, after I had made a pleasant little journey to Brookwood, the famous Labor College, located in the woods, near Katonah, 41 miles north of New York, on the Harlem division of the New York Central Railroad.

Brookwood has lived for eight years, getting bigger every year. A fine new woman's dormitory (brick), and a library (stone), have been built since I visited them before.

A graduating class of 32 this year was composed of miners, textile workers, painters, railroad workers, machinists, and all are planning to go back to work (if they can find jobs), and generally they will go back to work in the same industries from which they came.

And herein lies the fundamental difference between labor colleges and the other kind. The aim of Brookwood is to send these miners (after their years of study) back to the mines, the textile workers back to the mills, the painters back to their paint pots, the railroad workers back to the railroads, and the machinists back to the shops.

If these young men and women graduates, instead of going to Brookwood, had gone to the other kind of colleges the aim would have been to take them out of the ranks of the wage-working class, to take them out of the mines, the mills, and the shops.

They would have been imbued with the idea that educated men are not needed in the mines, the mills, on the railroads and in the machine shops. Brookwood takes an *opposite* view and holds that the need for men of education in the ranks of the wage-workers is great.

In colleges of the other kind the talk would be, it is bad to educate common workers, it makes them discontented. The talk in Brookwood is that the workers ought to be discontented (because most of them are being robbed) and we want to make them discontented. Not so that they will shun the working class, but so that they may make effective demands for justice and fair play to the class to which they belong, and in which they mean to stay.

So there is not much talk at Brookwood about America being a land of "glorious opportunities" because Brookwood knows that what is meant by those opportunities are the opportunities that may come to perhaps one in a thousand to get out of the wage-working class and get into the profits-taking class, to quit earning wages and live on the profits of other persons' wages, and not merely to live on these profits, but to pile up fortunes from these profits.

So Brookwood teaches the worker that the really great opportunity is to remain a worker, and to seek to inspire other workers to demand that a continually larger and larger share of the wealth produced by industry shall go to those who produce it, and a continually smaller share to those who reap profits from other folks' labor, and from monopolistic control of opportunities. That is, of opportunities to apply labor to the land and the raw materials out of which all wealth must be produced.

Brookwood's slogan is *"Educate the workers to work in the workers' movement."*

CHESTER C. PLATT.

The Study Table

The World War

Here are three important books*—books, too, of fascinating interest—not to be missed by any student of the causes and character of the World War.

The first two volumes have to do with the now familiar question of war guilt. Who was to blame for the vast catastrophe of the nations in 1914? Since the easy faith of the war days that Germany, or at least the Central Powers were to blame for everything—a verdict duly recorded in the Treaty of Versailles, where the Allies, after the example of the ancient Gauls, cast their swords into the scales of justice—there has come a complete change over informed and intelligent opinion. Vast stores of official documents have been opened up during the last ten years; personal memoirs have been published by all, or nearly all, the chief actors in the colossal drama of diplomacy and arms; new knowledge of various kinds, from a bewildering variety of sources, has come sweeping down upon us like a flood. The result, in the beginning at least, was confusion. Then, as information was sifted and facts made clear, there came the startling discovery that the universal odium heaped upon Germany was unjust. The government of the former Kaiser was by no means exclusively responsible for the outbreak of the war. The Treaty of Versailles was a lie as well as an abomination. Then followed, hard upon this discovery, what has come to be known as "the revision" of history. This was begun by the prophetic work of such men as Francis Neilson and E. D. Morel in England, and G. Demartial in France. It was established as a sober scientific enterprise by Professor Sidney B. Fay, of Smith College. It has been caught up and carried on by a host of historical students in all European countries, who in a decade have produced a formidable literature. It may be said without exaggeration that all competent historians to-day are "revisionists." The old idea of German guilt is now universally regarded as a "myth." The new and final judgment is not yet clear—unless Professor Fay makes it clear in his long-promised book, now announced for publication this fall! It may be said that no volume in our time is more eagerly awaited than this. Meanwhile, the "revisionist" historians, with an ever-growing sense of authority, are distributing responsibility among the belligerents. Some incline to the right, holding the Central Powers predominantly, though by no means wholly to blame for the disaster. More are swinging to the left, stressing with increasing force the guilt of Serbia, Russia, France and England. All have abandoned the preposterous idea of a conspiracy in Berlin and Vienna against the peace of the world, and now assess responsibility against all the powers, with the possible exception of Belgium, for a conflict in which all become involved in furtherance of their special and wholly selfish national interests.

The two books by Renouvin and Lutz are excellent examples of the tendencies just referred to. Their divergence from one another in outlook and opinion is strikingly indicated by their reaction upon Professor Harry Elmer Barnes's "The Genesis of the World War," which created such a sensation two years ago. Thus, Renouvin refers to "polemical writers" to whom "American opinion has become a prey," and instances Professor Barnes as the outstanding example of what he means. Lutz, on the other hand, takes pains to name Professor Barnes in connection with Professor Schmitt's judgment that "his (Barnes's) book . . . will remain the classic exposition of British policy." These are perhaps not unnatural reactions respectively of a Frenchman and a German. But the important thing to note is that both these men succeed on the whole in rising above their national prejudices onto a high plane of detached and impartial scholarship; and that, whatever their individual inclinations, they are as one in putting by the war-myth of German guilt, and seeking in the light of the new information now available a drastic revision of world opinion.

Renouvin's book belongs to the right wing of the "revisionist" school of historians, in that it lays stress upon the initial responsibility of Germany and especially of Austria for what took place in 1914. It bears, however, not a trace of propaganda; on the contrary, it is characterized throughout by the most rigorous standards of historical research. The book is remarkable for its calmness, poise, fairness of spirit, and easy handling of vast masses of information. The clarity of the work is truly extraordinary. Of all the many volumes that I have read upon the desperately tangled problem of war guilt, this work by Renouvin is by all odds the clearest.

If we examine the book to find out the secret of its clarity, it is easy to observe that the thread which leads the author through the labyrinth of despatches, letters, reports, memoirs, and governmental books of various colors, is his fixation of attention upon Berlin and Vienna. Whereas most other writers, in their study of the problem, have jumped around from Berlin to Vienna, to Paris, to St. Petersburg, to Paris, to Belgrade, to Brussels, and then back again to Berlin and Vienna, Renouvin keeps his attention almost exclusively riveted upon the capitals of the Central Empires, and tells the story as it unwound itself in these two closely connected centers of interest. It is easy, perhaps inevitable, for Renouvin to do this, because of his conviction that, whatever the complicity and responsibility of other powers, the decisive moves in the game were made in the Ballplatz and the Wilhelmstrasse. For Renouvin differs from most of the "revisionists" in believing that the decisive moment in those hectic days of July, 1914, came not with the Russian mobilization, but with the Austrian declaration of war upon Serbia. It was what came **before** this declaration rather than what came **after**, in his judgment, which determined the issues of war and peace. "Now, Germany and Austria," he says, "were **alone** in desiring this provocation. . . . They would not consent to any solution other than that of violent action. . . . So far as

(*) (1) "The Immediate Origins of the War," by Pierre Renouvin. Published by the Yale University Press. $5.

(2) "Lord Grey and the World War," by Hermann Lutz. Published by Alfred A. Knopf. $5.

(3) "Propaganda Technique in the World War," by Harold D. Lasswell. Published by Alfred A. Knopf. $3.

the immediate origins of the conflict are concerned, that is the one fact which dominates all the others."

It is probable that, in his presentation of this thesis, Renouvin has presented the strongest case against the Central Powers that can be written. The strength and importance of his book lie in its careful statement of all that can be said by the scientific historian against Germany and Austria. It is this very fact that makes so enormously significant his "revisionist" position—his concession of points which make so utterly baseless the Versailles verdict of German guilt. Thus, he makes it perfectly plain that, as between Germany and Austria, Germany's responsibility was confined to granting a "blank check" to her ally in her proposed moves against Serbia and was thus indirect, whereas Austria's responsibility up to the declaration, and beyond, was wholly aggressive and therefore direct. He shows that the murder of the Austrian Archduke—the spark which set off the vast explosion—was the result of a conspiracy in which Serbian government officials were directly, and the Serbian government itself was indirectly, involved; and that Austria, therefore, had a cause of provocation and outrage so strong that any act of protection and reprisal, short of war itself, was justifiable. He concedes that Russia was consistently aggressive, and goes far toward endorsing John S. Ewart's verdict that the Tsar must share equal responsibility with Franz Joseph for what took place. He admits, as indeed he must, that Germany and Austria never at any time desired a general European war, and that the plot of world-conquest and world-mastery is as mythical as the famous "Potsdam Conference." He agrees that after the prospect of a general war became imminent—thanks, largely, to Russia—Germany exhausted every means within her power to hold back her ally, Austria, doing far more in this regard than France or even England did in the matter of holding back their ally, Russia. Had war been prevented after that fateful July 28th, to Germany and to Germany alone would have belonged the credit! But it is the pith of Renouvin's case that this was too late; the damage had been done, predominantly by the Central Powers.

The weakness of Renouvin's book is coincident with its strength. His very absorption with what was going on in Berlin and Vienna in the fateful weeks of July makes him neglectful of what was going on in Paris and London, and to a considerable extent with what was going on in St. Petersburg. His silence about Paris especially goes far toward invalidating his whole case. A careful reader of Bausman, and especially of Renouvin's compatriot, G. Demartial, is tempted to feel that Renouvin has deliberately cut out of his story the most important chapter. The student of Neilson, Morel, Barnes, and now of Lutz, must feel the same way about his neglect of England. **There were decisive forces making for a general war all over Europe, at the very time when there were decisive forces making for a localized war between Austria and Serbia; and as the latter forces were at work in Berlin and Vienna, so the former forces were at work in St. Petersburg, Paris, and London.** Austria was aggressive and stubborn in precipitating a separate war with Serbia, and Germany did not stop her. Russia was aggressive and stubborn in precipitating a general war, and England did not stop her, while France egged her on. The very moment that the general war hove in sight, Germany did her utmost to save the situation, while France and England did nothing, or worse than nothing. It is these facts that persuade the majority of "revisionists" today that the Russian mobilization and not the Austrian declaration of war was the finger that pulled the trigger, and that a larger share of responsibility, therefore, belongs to the Triple Entente than to the Central Empires. It is just these facts that Renouvin neglects. His book, therefore, for all its scholarship and fine spirit, is a one-sided statement of the case.

This criticism of Renouvin's book is rendered unanswerable, it seems to me, by Lutz's book. This is in general a study of the basic problem of war guilt; more particularly it is a study of England's share in this guilt; more particularly still, it is a study of Sir Edward Grey, and an answer to his *apologia,* "Twenty-five Years, 1892-1916." Lutz, though a German, conceals nothing of Germany's part in the cataclysm, though he is strongly inclined to attribute it to stupid and unimaginative statesmanship rather than to deliberate wickedness. At the same time, he brings strongly to the fore those very factors in the situation, centering in the Allied countries, which Ewart and Barnes have done so much to elucidate, and which Renouvin, as I have said, almost completely ignores. Especially does he make plain the English side of the tragedy. As early as 1906, and later in 1912, England became entangled with France. This entanglement was on the one hand kept secret from Parliament and the English people, and even from most of the Asquith Cabinet; and on the other hand was allowed to draw tighter and tighter through the years in the direction of an armed alliance. When the crisis came, England found herself tied. With a sincere desire to preserve peace, she was able to take only the feeblest steps to this end; in spite of her best intentions, she found herself inextricably involved in the Russian and French moves toward war. Not so much in what she did, as in what she did not and could not do, lies England's complicity. Deeper down than this, as evils dark and dire, are the betrayal of the English people in concealing from them the facts which involved the lives and deaths of millions, the hideous hypocrisy of grabbing upon Belgium as a pretext for getting into a war already decided upon, and the deliberate wrong of the secret treaties which wrecked the peace at Versailles.

Responsibility for this black tale Lutz places squarely on Sir Edward Grey. His study of this man is devastating in the extreme; his dissection of his *apologia* is one of the most ruthlessly terrible things that I have ever encountered. Lutz is doubtful if Grey was a deliberate Machiavelli, though he agrees that there is abundant reason for arguing so. But he prefers to believe that Grey was weak rather than wicked, stupid rather than malevolent—at bottom, a man utterly incompetent for the enormously important tasks he had to perform. Grey must be classified with von Bethmann-Hollweg rather than with Berchtold, Isvolsky, and Poincaré. Yet, before he was done, Grey had deceived his colleagues, lied to Parliament, and taken his unhappy country into the most ghastly war in history. How can this man sleep nights? Will he lie quiet even in a Westminster Abbey grave?

I have left little space for Professor Lasswell's

book. Yet it is one which no reader of UNITY can afford to miss. It is a study, as its title indicates, of what propaganda is and what propaganda does in war-time, as shown by the experience of the Great War. The book is valuable as a collection of the propaganda stories and stunts that were cooked up for popular consumption in 1914-1918. It is invaluable as a revelation of the purposes and aims behind this propaganda material, and the technique by means of which it was so triumphantly "put over."—O, how we were fooled! And, lest we be fooled again, let us put this book upon the shelves, and take it down when the next war comes along.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Correspondence

The Brahmo Centenary Celebration in India

Editor of UNITY:

I am just in receipt of personal letters from India, under date of August 23, stating that the Centenary Celebration of the founding of the Brahmo Somaj had begun under highly favoring auspices. Delegates in unexpectedly large numbers from all parts of India had arrived in Calcutta. At the opening meeting, Dr. Rabindranath Tagore took the principal part in the Divine Service, and gave a highly impressive address on the life and work of Ram Mohun Roy, the founder of the Brahmo Somaj. This was the more gratifying from the fact that Dr. Tagore had been rather seriously ill for several months, and it was a matter of general rejoicing that he had so far recovered as to allow him to be present and take so prominent part. His address is to appear in the next issue of *The Modern Review* (of Calcutta).

It was greatly regretted that the Unitarian delegates from America could not be present at the opening meetings. They will be warmly welcomed when they arrive later. The Centenary Committee has planned an extensive program of meetings, consisting of lectures, addresses, social gatherngs, and so forth, to be held in the various large cities of India; and to continue on until into January. As is known to many of the readers of UNITY, the American delegation will be an influential and thoroughly representative one, consisting of Dr. Southworth, President of The Meadville Theological School, and Mrs. Southworth; Dr. J. H. Lathrop, pastor of the First Unitarian Church, Brooklyn, and Mrs. Lathrop; and Dr. Reese, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference and President of Lombard College. These American Unitarians will take prominent parts in all the later meetings of the Centennial program.

It is greatly regretted that Dr. Samuel Eliot, who was so long President of the American Unitarian Association, will not be able to go, as was originally expected.

President Southworth will have the additional pleasure in connection with his visit to India of meeting and renewing his friendship with a number of Brahmo Somaj young men who have been his students in Meadville and who are now serving Brahmo congregations as ministers.

In *The Christian Register*, just at hand, I see the happy announcement that Dr. Reese is to give a series of three lectures before the University of Madras. I have received also the gratifying word that Dr. Southworth is to give a similar series at the same university.

J. T. SUNDERLAND.

Beer and Whisky at Home and Abroad

Editor of UNITY:

Following a recent visit to England it may be interesting to consider the temperance situation in that country and the reactions there from America.

In conversation with a leading London temperance worker I inquired when he though the Empire would undertake Prohibition. He sadly replied, "Not for a long time."

On July 18, 1928 the ministry of Labor reported that at that time there were 205,884 more unemployed persons than one year before. A Labor correspondent of the London *Daily News* has this summer estimated that the total population on the poverty line, or actually below it, is between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000 people. This is in a population far less than that of the United States. When we recollect the admittedly close relationship between intoxicants and much of the poverty of the world, we are almost aghast as we think of the economic prospects of hundreds of thousands of families in our beautiful sister country across the Atlantic.

Apparently whilst many of the humbler classes of Great Britain do not care about the future effects of intemperance, not a few leaders of the Labor and Liberal parties are keenly alive thereto. These men have been contending with the Tory party—now in power—because of the grip the last-mentioned organization has upon the protection and so-called regulation of the traffic in drink. This attitude of the Labor leaders has been evidenced during late debates in Parliament growing out of the proposal to reduce by one-quarter the licenses paid to the government by the public houses (saloons) of England. Philip Snowden, Ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer (Labor Party), when contesting suggestions to help the brewers, stated that whilst it was true the consumption of drink had fallen since the war, the profits of the trade had risen from £10,000,000 to £24,000,000 per year. He proved that despite efforts to make it appear that the beer and whisky businesses were "depressed," the profits on the turnover since 1914 had increased 200 per cent. "This," ironically claimed Snowden, "is the depressed industry!" As over the world, so is it in England, you give the business an inch and it takes an ell.

If one glances through the financial columns of the London newspapers it may be seen that whilst not a few big concerns representing various industries have announced meager or no gains since the war, the beer and spirit businesses have almost invariably reported huge profits and dividends on the capital invested. These breweries and whisky houses prosper on the habits and weaknesses of their customers, many of whom are in the lower strata of society.

Statistics comparing the arrests or convictions for drunkenness in England or her commonwealths with those in the United States are often misleading. I have seen men staggering or rolling into the gutters, unsteady men and women guzzling and jamming the doors of the public houses just as they did in American cities 40 years ago. Few seem to consider such sights worthy of notice. Such sights no longer obtain in the United States. The incisive replies to questions addressed at random to workmen on the American streets, the milk bottles and "full dinner pails" witnessed at the noon hour are all in striking contrast to experiences in other countries where even under governmental control intoxicants are used. Yet most English and colonial newspapers fail to publish facts as to the many successes of prohibition in America.

Apparently a majority of the English people desire to see a breakdown of Prohibition in America. Many families in the peerage, rich members of Parliament, some great endowments and trusts derive a large part of their incomes from the traffic in intoxicants. It seems to be inevitable that many leaders of public opinion under such circumstances look leniently upon rum-running into the United States. This attitude is largely rooted in the belief that if Prohibition is successful in America it will be only a question of time when England, in order to maintain a leading economic position, must face the onward march of reform. Personal habits must then be changed, beer and spirit profits will be diminished. As far as can be seen—in spite of much propaganda to the contrary—the fact is gradually being recognized that whereas American workers have a wonderful variety of delightful soft drinks, save money and enjoy home comforts, and keep clear-headed and efficient, their English brethren are often handicapped by drink. All the difference cannot be laid to Prohibition, but a large part of it can be. If we are disposed to take a selfish view of the world-wide drink situation the economic prospects of America seem very bright. But the true reformer in the United States does not wish to be selfish—his desire is to help humanity abroad.

Among the stirring advocates of temperance in Eng-

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

THE CENTENARY OF THE BRAHMO SOMAJ

Now that the Brahmo Somaj Centenary Celebration in India is beginning with great success and is attracting wide attention in India, the following article from Indian papers regarding the Somaj and its work, will be read with interest in this country.

(1.) The following is part of an editorial in *The Indian Messenger*, the Brahmo Somaj weekly of Calcutta:

"Our Centenary Celebrations have begun. One's mind travels back to the day when Ram Mohun Roy with only a few followers founded the Brahmo Somaj in a rented house at Chitpore. What opposition had he not to face! What prejudices had he not to fight! What calumnies had he not to put up with! Hindu orthodoxy was up in arms. The wealth and influence of Calcutta was organized against the newly-formed Somaj. Street boys would throw dust on the Ram Mohun Roy proceeding along the public roads, repeating lampoons composed to insult him. Those were days when men could be persuaded to believe that it was owing to him that cholera epidemics broke out in places. But the Raja bore all this in a meek and humble spirit, quite befitting the founder of the Universal Religion. He writes, 'By taking the path which conscience and sincerity direct, I, born a Brahman, have exposed myself to the complainings and reproaches even of some of my relations, whose prejudices are strong, and whose temporal advantage depends upon the present system. But these, however accumulated, I can tranquilly bear, trusting that a day will arrive when my humble endeavors will be viewed with justice—perhaps acknowledged with gratitude. At any rate, whatever men may say, I cannot be deprived of this consolation: My motives are acceptable to that Being who beholds in secret and compensates openly!'

"Verily, God beheld in secret and blessed Ram Mohun Roy's endeavors. Opposition melted away. The Brahmo Somaj endures. It has grown and developed. God raised successors to the Raja. Through their labor of love and sacrifice the Brahmo Somaj is what it is today. We thank God for the gift of these and many other heroic souls. What laborious days they spent in the service of the Somaj, what sleepless nights they passed to ponder over its problems! God be thanked that he raised for our guidance men such as these, of fearless faith and consuming love. May we be counted worthy of emulating their example."

(2.) The Rev. Dr. G. Y. Chitnis, minister of the Prarthana (Brahmo) Somaj, Bombay, writes in *The Times of India:*

"The Brahmo Somaj has completed its first hundred years. It was on the twentieth of August, 1828, that the great Ram Mohun Roy, who is fittingly called the Father of Modern India, founded his important movement of religious and social reform.

"The history of the Brahmo Somaj is the history of Modern India; the aim of this movement from the beginning has been to advocate a purely spiritual conception of God and His relation to man and to discourage meaningless rites and ceremonies which have been mechanically adhered to without realizing their inner meaning. It stands for the conception of the supremacy and sovereignty of the spiritual life and, if it advocates reform, it is solely because reform is the legitimate consequence of this conception.

"The Brahmo Somaj has been slowly winning a victory over the traditional attitude of philosophic illusionism on the one hand and corrupt immoral religious practices on the other. The loosening of caste distinctions, the uplift of the oppressed classes, the education and freedom of women and the growth of civic and national consciousness are some of the best achievements to the credit of this movement. Yet it is not in the light of the long tale of social and educational reform that we can properly judge the value of a religious movement like the Brahmo Somaj. I wish I could recount here in detail the untold sufferings of the earliest members and workers of this movement. They were outcast by orthodoxy of every type and they were persecuted; but it has often been found that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church ,and the church of the Brahmo Somaj has been reared in its early beginnings upon the soil made fertile by the very life-blood of its workers and missionaries.

"The Brahmo Somaj is essentially a national movement; in fact it is the only movement among the many other movements in the country which can be called truly national. And because it is truly national, it is also international—in a country like India, none can become a nationalist without at the same time becoming an internationalist. The main work of the Brahmo Somaj has been naturally done in India and among the Hindus; but time and again it has sent out missionaries to distant parts of the world to preach its gospel of the oneness of God and the oneness of humanity. Raja Ram Mohun Roy, the founder, was the first Indian to cross the seas. He went to England and was warmly received by the various representatives of the Christian Church, more especially by the Unitarians, whose religious belief is very much akin to the creed of the Brahmo Somaj. Brahmanand Keshab Chunder Sen, the third great leader of the Brahmo Somaj, went to England in 1870 and he also was received with great enthusiasm by the English public.

"Then the great Congress of Religions was held in Chicago in 1893 to which the Brahmo Somaj sent the Rev. Bhai Partap Chunder Muzumdar and Prof. B. B. Nagarkar as its representatives. Both Mr. Muzumdar and Prof. Nagarkar toured in the United States, speaking from pulpits and platforms, and they gave Americans some idea as to what the culture and the civilization of India stood for. I need not recall here the details of the tragic end of Bhai Baladev Narayan, who ventured to travel in Persia preaching the gospel of Brahmoism among the Muslims.

"This was of course in the days when the name of the Brahmo Somaj stunk in the nostrils of orthodoxy; now the times have changed, so much so that the Brahmo Somaj is at present threatened with the common danger of too much verbal appreciation which does not involve any practical obligation. Today people are ready to admire if we bid for admiration. It is not admiration, however, that the Somaj seeks, but a practical adherence to its tenets.

"As an important part of its Centennial Celebration, the Brahmo Somaj has organized a large mission party consisting of the delegates of the English and American Unitarians, some liberal religious representatives of Japan and some of the workers of the Brahmo Somaj. The party will tour in all the principal towns in the country and is expected in Bombay in the middle of December. There will also be another mission going to the far East. It will visit Burmah, Singapore and Japan and link up the work

---

land are Lord and Lady Astor. The former will go anywhere, preside at any meeting, lend the prestige of his great wealth and social position on behalf of the cause. Because of his untiring fight on the entrenched foes of temperance he has forfeited the notable political preferment which might have been his for the asking. Lord Astor is of American descent. His wife—a brilliant member of the House of Commons—was a Virginian.

Returning to America this summer there sat near us in the dining saloon of the S. S. "Republic" a family of German-Americans, consisting of the parents and five beautifully behaved children. One day the father talked about the coming presidential election. He claimed that prior to national Prohibition about 20 per cent of the fathers' incomes in very many families had gone to drink. With Prohibition a large part of that kind of expenditure had ceased. As a consequence many of the women of the United States have had the telephones, radios, cars, many other home enjoyments and happier home life. He argued that if only an implied setback to Prohibition seizes the country a slow-coming but ultimate radical change for the worse in the position and pleasures of American women may be expected. He impressively emphasized his belief that the result rests with the women of America.

WILLIAM C. ALLEN.

Philadelphia, 1928.

OCTOBER

Marks the possibility of real savings in Autumn and Winter wardrobes. For through the use of this Service many previously worn garments—of men, women and children—may be recovered to further usefulness and good appearance. Fine equipment, experience and skill combine towards making our cleansing so dependable.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 6281 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Equipment for Understanding the Community Church Movement

Piper, The Community Church, 160 pages
Paper bound $1.00
Cloth bound 1.50
Hooker, How Can Local Churches Come Together?
82 pages, paper bound..... .25
Five assorted tracts..... .10

THE COMMUNITY CHURCHMAN

Is a monthly periodical which reports the news of various kinds of interdenominational churches ranging from fundamentalist to liberal, seeking whatever light may be found in each experiment in community cooperation. It stresses particularly news of social activities in churches. Sample copy, 10 cents. One dollar per year.

COMMUNITY CHURCH PUBLISHING COMPANY
Park Ridge, Illinois

THE BANKRUPTCY OF CHRISTIAN SUPERNATURALISM

By William Montgomery Brown

240 pages, paper bound, 75c

Bradford-Brown Educational Company
Galion, Ohio

Ready October 1, 1928. Send for copy on approval

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

of the Brahmo Somaj with the activities of the liberal religious centers in the Far East."

IS THE CANADIAN LIQUOR SYSTEM WORKING

"The facts are overwhelming and at hand, showing that instead of creating respect for law, it increases lawlessness; instead of controlling the liquor traffic, it gives an infinitely better opportunity for the unlawful traffic in liquor.

"Sir Hugh McDonald, son of the famous John A. McDonald, has declared:

" 'There is as much unlawful drinking under Government control as under prohibition. The present law is in the very nature of things difficult of enforcement. It was far less difficult to secure convictions under prohibition than under Government control.'

"The Vancouver *Sun* declares:

" 'The people decided on a policy of restricted alcoholic consumption to the lowest possible figure. The Government has made this piling up of revenue the chief purpose of the act. Moderation does not moderate, government control does not control. The British Canada liquor system has actually failed.'

"Another Canadian paper, and this paper was originally for Government control, says:

"Rum-runners, gunmen, thugs and all the parasites which thrive in the miasma of the underworld are fostered by the policy now in force. Calculations show that bootleggers in this province handle as much liquor as the Government stores.'

"One of the public officials in Canada has declared:

" 'Never in the history of this country was bootlegging comparable in magnitude or murderous results to what it is today.'

"Douglas Mackey, in the New York *Times*, says:

" 'These provincial Governments are definitely and profitably in the retail beer and spirits business * * * Under this system the State is in big business. In Quebec alone $17,807,000 was spent in the liquor commission shops.'

"Another name for the old saloon.

A Canadian official, writing upon this subject, says:

" 'The bootlegger is more in evidence than ever. One of the loudest assertions of the modernists in the campaign of 1920 was that with the advent of Government control the trade known as bootlegging would ultimately cease. But the fact is that never has bootlegging flourished to such an extent as under the present system'."—Senator Borah, in *The Statesman*.

TREATMENT OF MINORITIES

The Russian Government has issued a Decree compelling all officials stationed in districts where there are national minorities to learn the language of the minorities within a given time, on pain of dismissal. Will other nations follow the example given by Russia? A similar Decree on the part of all frontier countries ruling over minorities would greatly contribute to the pacification of national minorities. (*Die Frau im Staat.*)